PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 32329	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below	-
International application No. PCT/IL2006/000834	International filing date (day/month/year) 19 July 2006 (19.07.2006)	Priority date (day/month/year) 19 July 2005 (19.07.2005)	
International Patent Classification (8th See relevant information in Form I	h edition unless older edition indicated) PCT/ISA/237		
Applicant SPECTRUM DYNAMICS LLC			
		•	

1.	 This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a). 				
2.	This REPORT consists of a total of 6 sheets, including this cover sheet.				
	In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.				
3.	This report contains indication	s relating to the following items:			
	Box No. I	Basis of the report			
	Вох №. П	Priority			
	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability			
	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention			
	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement			
	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited			
	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application			
	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application			
4.	The International Bureau will conot, except where the applicant date (Rule 44bis .2).	ommunicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority			
		Date of issuance of this paper			

	Date of issuance of this report 13 January 2009 (13.01.2009)
The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	Authorized officer Simin Baharlou
Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70	e-mail: pt09.pct@wipo.int
Form PCT/IB/373 (January 2004)	

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

INTERNAT	TIONAL SEARC	HING AUTHO	ORITY		
To: HADASS	A WATERMAN LICH (1995) LT				PCT
	CHEM BEGIN S			13/1	RITTEN OPINION OF THE
RAMAT	GAN, ISRAEL :	52 52 1			ONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY
					(PCT Rule 43bis.1)
				Date of mailing (day/month/year)	01 JUL 2008
1 ''	's or agent's file r	eferençe		FOR FURTHER	ACTION See paragraph 2 below
. 32329		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
I	nal application No).	International filing date	(day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)
PCT/IL06		Sinter (MC)	19 July 2006 (19.07.200		19 July 2005 (19.07,2005)
1	A61B 6/00(2006)	` / `	r both national classificat	on and IPC	
	600/436	.01)			
Applicant					
SPECTRU	M DYNAMICS	FTC	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	- 	
. 1. This o	pinion contains in	ndications relat	ting to the following item	3:	· ·
\boxtimes	Box No. I	Basis of the	opinion .		•
	Box No. II	Priority			
	Box No. III	Non-establis	hment of opinion with reg	gard to novelty, inve	ntive step and industrial applicability
	Box No. IV	Lack of unity	y of invention		
	Box No. V		atement under Rule 43bis, citations and explanation		novelty, inventive step or industrial atement
	Box No. VI	Certain docu	ments cited		
	Box No. VII	Certain defec	cts in the international app	olication	•
	Box No. VIII	Certain obser	rvations on the internation	nal application	
2. FUR	THER ACTIO	N .			
If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bls(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.					
IPEA	a written reply to	gether, where	considered to be a writt appropriate, with amenda spiration of 22 months fro	nents, before the ex	PEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the piration of 3 months from the date of mailing whichever expires later.
For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.					
3. For fu	rther details, see i	notes to Form I	PCT/ISA/220.		<u> </u>
	mailing address		Date of complet	ion of this opinion	Authorized officer
0	Asil Stop PCT, Attn Commissioner for Pa		11 June 2008 (1	1.06.2008)	Ruturalia
	P.O. Box 1450 Mexandria, Virginia	22313-1450		•	Tolophone No. 571-272-4745
Facsimile No. (571) 273-3201 Form PCT/ISA/237 (cover sheet) (April 2007)					
rorm PCI/R	SAJZ3 / (Cover sh	eet) (April 200	'')		~

•	WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTE	RNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.	
PCT/IL06/00834	•

Box N	o. I Basis of this opinion
1. With	regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
\bowtie	the international application in the language in which it was filed
2. 🗆	a translation of the international application into, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).
3. With	This opinion has been established taking into account the rectification of an obvious mistake authorized by or notified to this Authority under Rule 91 (Rule 43bis.1(a)) regard to any nucleotide aud/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, this opinion has been ished on the basis of:
V_3,00	-144 02 110 0036 01.
a.	type of material
	a sequence listing
	table(s) related to the sequence listing
b.	format of material
•	on paper
	in electronic form
c.	time of filing/furnishing
	contained in the international application as filed.
	filed together with the international application in electronic form.
	furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
). 🗀	In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
. Additio	onal comments:
_	
	,
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
m PCT/	SA/237(Box No. I) (April 2007)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE

International application No. PCT/IL06/00834

INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AU	THORIT	LX		•
Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 b. applicability; citations and explanation	is.1(a)(i) ons supp	with regard to orting such st	o novelty, inventive step atement	or industrial
1. Statement				. ,
Novelty (N)	Claims	Please See Con	ntinuation Sheet	YES
•	Claims	Please See Con	ntinuation Sheet	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	Please See Con	ntinuation Sheet	YES
			ntinuation Sheet	NO
. Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	Piease See Con	ntinuation Sheet	YES
	•		ntinuation Sheet	NO
A Day of the second		·		
2. Citations and explanations: Please See Continuation Sheet			•	
A least not community of the c			•	•
		•		
				•
			•	
			•	
	•		•	
	•			•
				-
	•			
			•	
		٠		
·				•
				•
•				
·			•	•

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/IL06/00834

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

V.1. Reasoned Statements:

The opinion as to Novelty was positive (Yes) with respect to claims 1-276, 283-289, 291, 293, 296-350, 352, 364-366, 368-370, 373-379, 383, 385-448

The opinion as to Novelty was negative (No) with respect to claims NONE

The opinion as to Inventive Step was positive (Yes) with respect to claims NONE

The opinion as to Inventive Step was negative(NO) with respect to claims 1-276, 283-289, 291, 293, 296-350, 352, 364-366, 368-370, 373-379, 383, 385-448

The opinion as to Industrial Applicability was positive (YES) with respect to claims 1-276, 283-289, 291, 293, 296-350, 352, 364-366, 368-370, 373-379, 383, 385-448

The opinion as to Industrial Applicability was negative(NO) with respect to claims NONE

V. 2. Citations and Explanations:

Claims 1-276, 283-289, 291, 293, 296-350, 352, 364-366, 368-370, 373-379, 383, 385-448 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over DeVito et al.

DeVito et al. show a SPECT type of tomographic imaging system. The system can move in relation to the patient (column 6, lines 29-40). The system can accept user inputted commands or data to control the system (column 13, lines 35-67). The system is described for use in a heart perfusion study. The patient is given either a physical or pharmacologic stress. During stress, a radio-pharmaceutical is then administered, and the patient is imaged. After a period of rest, another dose is administered and the patient is imaged again. The images of the stress period and rest period are compared. Such a technique is common and well known in the art for a myocardial perfusion study (column 24, lines 9-50). DeVito et al. further discusses imaging the brain, breast, or limbs.

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have imaged other parts of the body. Techniques for imaging other parts of the body are well known in the art, and would be administered to a patient suffering a condition in any other part of the body which would require imaging to evaluate. In addition, the use of a variety of different radiopharmaceuticals could be used in such a system, so long as they allow for the patient to be imaged appropriately. Also, the specific length of times for which the patient should be rested, stressed, and imaged can be different for different patients, and a physician would be able to determine the appropriate length of time. The physician will also be able to determine the appropriate dosage to administer to the patient.

Claims 1-276, 283-289, 291, 293, 296-350, 352, 364-366, 368-370, 373-379, 383, 385-448 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Ryals et al.

Ryals et al. show a method and apparatus for SPECT imaging. Ryals et al. describe SPECT systems which are moved around the area to be imaged, and notes that such systems are well known in the art. Ryals et al. also describe common cardiac perfusion studies, which involve examining the heart under a stress condition and a rest condition. The radionuclide introduced to the heart will follow the blood flow, and perfusion can be determined. Infarct and ischemic areas of the heart can be identified (column 1, line 40-column 2, line 24; also column 8, line 56-column 9, line 15; column 16, line 61-column 17, line 20).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have imaged other parts of the body.

Techniques for imaging other parts of the body are well known in the art, and would be administered to a patient suffering a condition in

Form PCT/ISA/237 (Supplemental Box) (April 2007)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/IL06/00834

Supplemental Box .

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

any other part of the body which would require imaging to evaluate. In addition, the use of a variety of different radiopharmaceuticals could be used in such a system, so long as they allow for the patient to be imaged appropriately. Also, the specific length of times for which the patient should be rested, stressed, and imaged can be different for different patients, and a physician would be able to determine the appropriate length of time. The physician will also be able to determine the appropriate dosage to administer to the patient.

Claims 1-276, 283-289, 291, 293, 296-350, 352, 364-366, 368-370, 373-379, 383, 385-448 tack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over Bishop et al.

Bishop et al. show a cardiovascular imaging and functional analysis system. The use of such a system for myocardial perfusion studies under stress is discussed ([0077]). The use of different types of radiopharmaceuticals is discussed ([0118]-[0120], [0125]).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have imaged other parts of the body. Techniques for imaging other parts of the body are well known in the art, and would be administered to a patient suffering a condition in any other part of the body which would require imaging to evaluate. In addition, the use of a variety of different radiopharmaceuticals could be used in such a system, so long as they allow for the patient to be imaged appropriately. Also, the specific length of times for which the patient should be rested, stressed, and imaged can be different for different patients, and a physician would be able to determine the appropriate length of time. The physician will also be able to determine the appropriate dosage to administer to the patient.

Claims 1-276, 283-289, 291, 293, 296-350, 352, 364-366, 368-370, 373-379, 383, 385-448 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.

Form PCT/ISA/237 (Supplemental Box) (April 2007)